
IX. LAND USE MAP

The Land Use Map and this Plan, together, are a statement of intent for the development and preservation of land within the District. The Land Use Map must be used in conjunction with the Plan. The Map shows graphically what the community will be like in the future. The goals illustrate the values of the community. Future development proposals will be evaluated for conformance with both the Plan and the Land Use Map. Future amendments to the Plan will be evaluated for consistency with the goals and strategies contained in the Plan.

The Land Use Map is forward looking and projects land uses for the future. It is based on identified community goals, existing services and facilities, and projected needs.

The Map will have many uses. It will be used by the Zoning Commission and the County Commission to determine when development proposals are appropriate or not. Developers will use it when deciding where to propose new uses. Prospective property purchasers will rely on the Map to guide them in their deliberations. And members of the community will know how and where growth will occur.

The Land Use Map classifies all lands in the Zoning District into the broad categories explained below. Land uses are designated in a general manner-- lines do not necessarily follow property boundaries and are flexible.

A. Land Use Categories

1. Commercial: Land use classification that permits offices and facilities for the buying and selling of retail goods and services. The zoning regulation contains further definitions, such as tourist commercial, neighborhood commercial, recreational commercial, neighborhood office, and mixed-use.

2. Natural Resources: Land which is essentially unimproved and used for the conservation of natural resources, the managed production of resources, outdoor recreation, buffer zones, view protection or public health and safety.

3. Low Density Residential: Land use characterized by a combination of open space with very low density residential development no greater than one (1) dwelling unit per twenty (20) acres. Clustered housing is encouraged to allow the maximum amount of open space to be preserved. Highly visible ridgelines and hillsides will be retained as open space within the classification. Development of land in this category is often limited by physical constraints, such as steep slopes. Development will be evaluated on an individual basis and must be compatible with environmental considerations.

4. Institutional: Includes parks, schools, and other community owned facilities.

5. Residential: Land designated for buildings consisting only of dwelling units and accessory structures, with density greater than one (1) dwelling unit per twenty (20) acres.

6. Entry Corridor: Key trafficways and abutting land which require careful development design to conform to Plan goals and policies.

7. Mixed Use: Allows for uses not inconsistent with community needs; light industrial, including but not limited to equipment storage, rental storage units, satellite dishes and receiving equipment, gravel pits, warehouses, sewage treatment pond, cement mixing plants, bus storage and utility use. Specific use definition will be provided by zoning regulations as to siting requirements and use conditions.

LAND USE MAP

X. TRAILS PLAN AND MAP

A goal of this Plan is to foster the development of a Trails Plan within the District. Recreational trails are important to the community. There are many existing trails which receive year-round use by residents and visitors alike.

The Plan recognizes that such trails will require voluntary participation and cooperation by the land owners involved.

An additional goal is to implement the Trails Plan with a Trail Map delineating a trail system that connects major activity centers and provides access to public lands. Existing and proposed trails could be included.

The precise location for trails will be determined during the appropriate planning process.

XI. APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

The Gallatin Canyon/Big Sky Advisory Committee developed a questionnaire to assist the Committee in developing this Plan. The questionnaire was distributed to all members of the Big Sky Owners Association and mailed to other property owners and residents of the district. Approximately 1,500 questionnaires were mailed and approximately 425 questionnaires were returned. The results are summarized below:

Reasons for Buying Property in the District:

REASONS	NUMBER
Recreation	94
Peace and quiet	69
Quality of Life	44
Retirement and Vacations	38
Investment	14
Like It	11
People	10
Hiking and Skiing	10
Employment	9
Open Space	6
Location	5
Plan to Build	2

Opinions on Growth at Big Sky:

OPINION	NUMBER	PERCENT
Like	215	51%
Neutral	112	28%
Dislike	68	17%

Level of Recreational Opportunities Provided:

LEVEL	NUMBER	PERCENT
Same	132	56%
More	101	43%
Less	4	3%

Favorite Place in the District:

PLACE	NUMBER
Meadow Village	60
Lone Mountain/Skiing	49
Big Sky	58
Gallatin River	28
Wilderness Areas	19
All of It	17
Creeks	15
Golf Course	9
Undeveloped Areas	7
Gallatin Canyon	8
Hidden Village	4
South End	5
Cross-Country Trails	4
My House	20

Location of Future Business Growth:

LOCATION	NUMBER
Concentrated (Total)	240
Meadow Village	134
Mountain Village	64
Equally Among Areas	63

LOCATION	NUMBER
Dispersed (Total)	121
Canyon	22
Spur and Village	37
All Regions	50

Amount of Services Offered at Big Sky:

SERVICES	NUMBER	PERCENT
Same	213	59%
More	139	39%
Less	9	5%

Extend Water and Sewer Lines:

EXTEND	NUMBER	PERCENT
Yes	160	53%
No	140	47%

Location of New Lines:

LOCATION	NUMBER
New Areas	5
Meadow Village	4
Where Needed	4
Other	10

Need for Affordable Housing:

NEED	NUMBER	PERCENT
Yes	240	62%
No	53	14%
Neutral	96	25%

Preserve Wildlife Migration Areas:

PRESERVE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Yes	346	86%
No	18	5%
Neutral	37	9%

Set Aside Permanent Open Space:

SET ASIDE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Yes	392	92%
No	9	2%
Neutral	24	6%

Preserve Mountain Vistas:

PRESERVE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Yes	381	95%
No	6	1%
Neutral	15	4%

Community Center:

CENTER	NUMBER	PERCENT
Yes	198	50%
No	75	19%
Neutral	126	32%

Prohibit Billboards and Signs:

PROHIBIT	NUMBER	PERCENT
Yes	391	96%
No	1	.05%
Neutral	14	4%

Create Sewer and Water District:

CREATE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Yes	245	63%
No	43	11%
Neutral	102	25%

Build Additional Arterial Roads:

BUILD	NUMBER	PERCENT
Yes	16	4%
No	294	74%
Neutral	90	23%

No Further Development of Recreational Facilities:

NO MORE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Agree	67	17%
Disagree	254	64%
Neutral	79	20%

No Further Development of Hotels, Motels, Restaurants, Etc:

NO MORE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Agree	75	21%
Disagree	202	57%
Neutral	75	21%

DEMOGRAPHICS OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS

Home Ownership Status:

OWN/RENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
Own	398	98.5%
Rent	6	1.5%

Location of Residence:

LOCATION	NUMBER	PERCENT
Meadow Village	154	35%
West Fork Meadows	50	11%
Hidden Village	50	11%
Karst Ranch Area	40	9%
Mountain Village	25	6%
Sweetgrass Hills	24	5%
Canyon South of Spur	19	4%
Spur to Meadow Village	17	4%
Rainbow Ranch Area	15	3%
Canyon - Karst to Spur	6	1%
Pinewood	2	
Lone Mountain Ranch	1	
Beaver Creek	1	
Other	35	8%

Use of Property:

USE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Year Round	95	29%
Rental Income	58	19%
Seasonal (Total)	162	52%
Summer & Winter	124	
Holiday & Vacation	85	
Winter Only	11	

Age of Head of Household:

AGE	NUMBER	PERCENT
0 -25	1	
26 -35	22	8%
36 - 50	30	10%
51 - 65	172	60%
65 +	60	22%

Occupations:

OCCUPATION	NUMBER	PERCENT
Retirees	89	26%
Physicians	53	16%
Lawyers	14	4%
Other Professional	89	26%
CEO	6	2%
Executives	3	1%
Business Owners	44	13%
Marketing	14	4%
Contractors	7	2%
Ranchers	6	2%
Engineers	4	1%
Homemakers	4	1%
Police/Fire	3	1%
Airline Pilots	2	1%

Type of Residential Dwelling Owned:

DWELLING	NUMBER	PERCENT
Condominium	199	51%
Single Family	189	49%
Mobile Home	1	

Value of Home:

VALUE	NUMBER	PERCENT
\$400,000 +	30	9%
\$200,000 - \$400,000	71	22%
\$100,000 - \$200,000	137	42%
\$50,000 - \$100,000	39	12%
\$30,000 - \$50,000	39	12%
Less than \$30,000	13	4%

Education Level: Head of Household:

EDUCATION	NUMBER	PERCENT
Post Graduate	161	46%
College Graduate	149	42%
Some College	25	7%
High School Graduate	17	5%

Household Income:

INCOME	NUMBER	PERCENT
\$100,000 +	102	47%
\$80,000 - \$100,000	24	11%
\$60,000 - \$80,000	27	13%
\$40,000 - \$60,000	39	18%
\$20,000 - \$40,000	20	9%
Less than \$20,000	3	1

Household Size:

SIZE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Single	34	9%
Two Members	194	54%
Three Members	43	12%
Four Members	49	14%
Five Members	30	8%
Six Members	7	2%
Seven Members	2	.5%
Eight Members	2	.5%
Nine Members	1	

Age of Household Members:

AGE	NUMBER	PERCENT
0 - 6 Years	42	7%
7 - 12 Years	50	8%
13 - 18 Years	58	9%
19 - 25 Years	44	7%
26 - 35 Years	34	5%
36 - 50 Years	186	30%
51 - 65 Years	171	27%
65 + Years	41	7%

XII. APPENDIX B: RESOURCE MATERIALS

Committee Reports and Presentations

Advisory Committee Environmental Subcommittee - "Zone Planning Study". Undated

"Ankeny Land Use Plan - Draft Summary", Undated

Big Sky Owners Association - Parks, Open Space and Trails Committee, July 20, 1992

"Conceptual Land Use Plan" - TM Land Partners, Westland Enterprises, Inc. - Simkins-Taylor Properties, August 14, 1991

Earth Science, Conservation and Wildlife

Gallatin Valley Land Trust - Fact Sheet Index and Fact Sheets 1 to 12, presentation by Executive Director Chris Boyd

Geology of the Gallatin Canyon - Presentation by Dr. Moak, MSU, Professor of Geology

"People and the Gallatin Elk Herd" - Allan Lovaas, Montana Fish and Game Department, April, 1970

"Wildlife and Big Sky" - Proceedings of The Montana Chapter of the Wildlife Society - Harold D. Picton and James Williams, February 5-6, 1992, presentation by Harold D. Picton, MSU Department of Biology

"Wildlife Corridors" - Carol Arnold, *California Coast & Ocean*, Summer 1990

Planning: General

"Accessory Apartments for Today's Communities" - Patrick Hare, *Planning Commissioners Journal* - Vol 1, No. 1, November/December 1991

"Managing the Planning Process" - *Small Town Planning Handbook*

"Land Use Law Workshop" - Conference, Montana Association of Planners, Buck's T-4, March 23/5, 1992

"Land Use Plan for the South Gallatin Zoning District" - Draft

Planning: Resort

"20th Century Architecture Finds Its Place in History: Miami Beach, Florida" - Jud Kurlanchcck and Richard Rickles, *Mountains and Shores*, Summer 1990

"Forum on Employee Housing Held in Whistler, British Columbia" - Paul McIntyre, *Mountains and Shores*, Spring 1991

"The Limits to Mountain Resort Growth" - Michael Beaudry, *Ski Area Management*, July 1991

"Mountain Resort Area Development and Management" - Doug Wittren and John Wilson, MSU Department of Earth Sciences, presentation by John Wilson, Associate Professor of Geography

"The Revolution of Telluride" - Steve Casimiro, *Powder '92*, October

Previous Studies

"Economic Feasibility Analysis for a Commercial Bank", James L. Brock, Bozeman, MT, October 22, 1986

"Update of an Economic Feasibility Analysis for a Commercial Bank", James L. Brock, Bozeman, MT, October 5, 1988

Transportation

"We Need your 2¢ Worth" - Montana Transportation Forum - August 1992

"Gallatin County Typical Section, Minimum Standards, Rural Subdivisions" - Rev. August 23, 1983

Presentation by Lee Alt, District Highway Engineer, Butte
Sewage

"Memo on Utilities" Wayne O. Hill, Rural Improvement District 305, August 5, 1991

"Preliminary Prospectus RID No. 305 for Big Sky Resort Taxation Committee" - Kerin & Associates, Bozeman, MT, July 30, 1991

"Sewer and Water System Capacity" - T. Threlkeld, April 20, 1992, Presentation by Terry Threlkeld

Westland Enterprises, Inc., et al, vs. Boyne USA, Inc., et al. - No. DV-84-100, District Court, 18th District, Gallatin County, "Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law", August 2, 1985

Westland vs. Boyne - No 87-465, Supreme Court of Montana, Opinion, April 27, 1989

"Long Term Compliance Work Plan for Wastewater Treatment and Disposal at Big Sky, Montana", MSE-HKM, Inc., Engineers, December, 1995.

f:\plng\bs\plan.896